and Linum leaione seems to me to go quite as well with the Mouchartia (formerly Linum then Helorciadium and now Apium) as with Linum Catharticum

I am glad to see that you have set up the Mull. Abg. in Dl. Prod. Immediately on receiving the book I wrote to Dl. in remonstrance and got what I thought but a very lame defence for it.

Some time ago I communicated to the Secy of the Royal Society your observation on the refusal to receive parcels for their fellows and got a long answer on behalf of the Council explaining how the excessive abuse of the liberty they gave to foreign correspondents obliged them to decline to act any more as such agents but to put all distribution into the hands of the owners – they are very ready to pay all charges on books etc sent for the Society

The clean sheets of Gen. Pl. as struck off will be sent you as before – there are now 5 sheets in type but only one gone to press – you shall have it as soon as we get the clean proofs.

I quite agree with you that Remouchamps Newfoundland Calluna is as bad a species as his brick boy – the comes to conclusions in a desperate hurry with very little examination

Ever yours sincerely

George Bentham

I put into a box going from Kew a copy of Gen. Pl. parts 1 and 2 for you to dispose of if you have an opportunity.

25, WILTON PLACE,
S.W.
Feby 11 1867

My dear Gray

Many thanks for your of the 21 and the notes etc. it contains. In reply to your Araliaceous question you will have seen by the Australian Flora that I have followed Seemann in substituting Heteropleurum for Paratropia for Goetner's character is good and ought to have been recognised. – I think however that Planchon's decaisne's views of Aralia and Panax which you have followed much more correct than Miquel's – and as to the order now that I have gone through Umbelliferae, although the endocarp is often

25 WILTON PLACE
S.W.

detached from the epocarp yet I have never found it thick and hardened so as to form pyrenes as in Oreoleaceae. Seemann's distinction putting Oralia into Umbelliferae and Hydrocotyle into Hederaceae seems to me even more untenable than it did at first sight.

As to Umbelliferae I have just gone through the whole except two or three small American genera of which our specimens are not very good and shall settle them to my best on the revision when I shall reexamine several genera now that I have got all roughly into their places. I find myself quite obliged to give up the orthospermous campylospermous and coelospermous seed as primary divisions the seed excavated in front may serve to separate the Choerophyllum set or the Conium and Cachrys set for instance as subtribes, and in other cases it may be a good generic character, but rarely more and in Bupleuroideae it is specific only. The vittae supposed to be on the seed in Crithmum Cachrys etc and in the pericarp in others is all bosh – I have always found the vallecular and commissural vittae within the pericarp – when the endocarp is excessively thin and closely adnate to the seed and the epocarp thick the vittae remain attached to it and detached from the epocarp. When the epocarp is so thin that the vittae show through it they are only in appearance but not really superficial.

As to Ammi and Apium they are closely allied – so are many other genera which yet must be artificially kept up and between those two the difference in the vittae is accompanied by a few others